

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 12-15 have been amended. Claims 31-37 have been added. Claims 1-15 and 31-37 are pending. Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Allowable subject matter

Allowability of claims 2 and 10 is noted with appreciation. Claims 2 and 10 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 2 and 10 are allowable.

Rejection[s] under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a semiconductor wafer having at least one region carrying information for identification, characterized in that the information for identification is provided by magnetic means, wherein the magnetic means comprise a series of magnetic regions and nonmagnetic regions configured to provide a code pattern within the at least one region carrying information for identification.

Claim 5

Claim 5 recites a semiconductor wafer having at least one region carrying information for identification, characterized in that the information for identification is provided by magnetic means, wherein the magnetic means comprise magnetic regions within the at least one region carrying information for identification having different magnetizations.

Claim 9

Claim 9 recites a method for providing on a semiconductor wafer at least one region carrying information for identification, comprising: providing a semiconductor wafer; and providing at least one region with magnetic means, wherein the magnetic means are provided in a series of magnetic regions and nonmagnetic regions configured to provide a code pattern within the at least one region carrying information for identification.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Katsuyuki (JP 58-169149).

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that

"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."

Therefore, with respect to claims 1, 5 and 9, to sustain this rejection the Katsuyuki reference must contain all of the above claimed elements of the respective claim. However, contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the Katsuyuki reference, the latter reference does not disclose a magnetic means comprising a series of magnetic regions and nonmagnetic regions configured to provide a code pattern within the region carrying information for identification as recited in claim 1; nor does it disclose magnetic regions within the region carrying information for identification having different magnetizations as recited in claim 5; and still further, the Katsuyuki reference does not disclose magnetic means are provided in a series of magnetic regions and nonmagnetic regions configured to provide a code pattern within the region carrying information for identification as recited in claim 9. In contrast, Katsuyuki discloses a glass substrate photomask 1 as opposed to a semiconductor substrate. Katsuyuki discloses the photomask 1 having a photomask pattern 2, as well as, a single magnetic film 3 on a peripheral part of the photomask substrate 1.

Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the Katsuyuki reference and should be withdrawn. Claims 1, 5 and 9 are allowable. Dependent claims (3, 4 and 7) and (11-14) depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, and therefore are allowable as well.

Rejection[s] Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuyuki (JP 58-169149) in view of Chang (US006197481B1) and Oishi (US006004405A). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reason. Dependent claims 6 and 15

depend from and further limit allowable independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, and therefore are allowable as well.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuyuki (JP 58-169149) in view of Oishi (US006004405A). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reason. Dependent claim 8 depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 1 and therefore is allowable as well.

Conclusion

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings, therefore, no new matter is introduced.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claims 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims (31-33); (34-36); and 37 depend from and further limit allowable independent claims 1, 5, and 10, respectively, and therefore are allowable as well.

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-15 and 31-37 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By:



Michael Balconi-Lamica

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 34,291

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800